How the Government Secretly Subsidises Books, P. 3

Even the Stock Market Votes for Peace

"Only a move toward the peace table in Vietnam could really turn this market around."
—A New York Stock Exchange floor broker as the market hits its lowest in three years, New York Times, *Oct. 7*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 32 October 17, 1966 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Bobby Bakerism On A World Scale

If Johnson really believes in co-existence, the place to prove it is in Vietnam. "Our task," he told the editorial writers in New York last Friday, "is to achieve a reconciliation with the East, a shift from the narrow concept of coexistence to the broader vision of peaceful engagement." If that were really his purpose, he could not find more willing collaborators than Ho Chi Minh and the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front. Ho Chi Minh has been trying all his life to find a basis not only for coexistence but for a "broader vision of peaceful engagement" with the West. This is why he negotiated the agreements to stay in the French Union after the war, and why he signed the Geneva pact in 1954, and why time after time he has offered to settle the present conflict on a basis which would give South Vietnam democratic self-government and neutrality in a framework which recognized the principle of Vietnam's essential national unity without insisting on reunification at this time.

The Place for Re-Engagement

A broad vision of peaceful engagement also lies behind the program of the NLF. In calling, from its beginning, for a neutral belt of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, the NLF suggested engaging three different neighboring peoples with different social systems in a common effort to insulate themselves from great Power politics and ideological rivalry. The latest interview given Wilfred Burchett by the head of the NLF also envisages peaceful engagement within South Vietnam in calling for the broadest kind of coalition government to restore peace and make possible social reconstruction. I am convinced from my talks last spring in Saigon and Cambodia that most Vietnamese on both sides are ready for just such a fraternal *re*-engagement. The NLF would like American help in reconstruction once American troops have left. The replacement of napalm with aid would be the symbol and the guarantee of just that peaceful engagement Johnson says he wants, but refuses to seek, in the one place where it counts, in the country our bombers have so ravaged North and South a recently returned flier described it as a lunar landscape, cratered and denuded.

We could not achieve a greater moral and political victory over China than to demonstrate, by a peace negotiated with the NLF, that co-existence with the United States is possible, that we do not oppose social change, that we are not the citadel of world counter-revolution. But that is not what Johnson means by co-existence and peaceful engagement. What he seeks is to buy the acquiescence of Moscow and of Eastern Europe in crushing the Vietnamese rebellion and if necessary China should Peking intervene. This is wheeler-dealerism on a world scale, the application to international affairs of those talents for seduction and corruption which have served Lyndon Johnson so well in his climb to power. He has been eager to talk with everybody except the brave men we have been fighting; he has offered concessions not only to Moscow but to Peking and even to Hanoi if they would abandon the South Vietnamese rebels to our merciless military machine. Not "let us reason together" but let us haggle together has been his guiding principle. To the blackmail of the North Vietnamese bombings, he adds the bribery of economic and political favors for East Europe. This is Bobby Bakerism globalized.

Not Welcome In Japan Either

"Tokyo (AP)—The government of Japan—America's strongest ally in this part of the world—is relieved he isn't coming to visit. Washington said Johnson wished to avoid embarrassing Prime Minister Sato with a visit that would tie Japan to allied participants in the Vietnam war [at Manila]. Besides the virtual certainty of anti-American demonstrations and possible violence, leaders of Japan's ruling party believe a Johnson visit could do little for Sato, already besmirched by corruption in his own party. There is little sentiment in Japan in favor of U.S. prosecution of the Vietnamese war although Japanese industries did a $35 million business supplying the American military last year. That figure is expected to exceed $150 million this year. . . . To Japanese newsmen yesterday, Vice Foreign Minister Shimoda said a Johnson visit at this time would stir up suspicion. . . ."
—Washington Evening Star, Oct. 7

Johnson has ruined morally all who deal with him at home and he will ruin all who deal with him abroad. Humphrey and Goldberg have been destroyed by the seductive arts that turned them into his tools, and the same fate awaits the East Europeans who accept his favors while he rains death and destruction worse than any mankind has seen since World War II on a small and poorly defended country. We do not compare Johnson to Hitler nor our country to Nazi Germany but Der Fuehrer at Munich, too, assured Chamberlain there would be peace in our time if only the West recognized the right of the Sudeten Germans to dismember Czechoslovakia in the name of self-determination. Every step of Nazi expansion, down to the Nazi-Soviet pact, was proclaimed as

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How the FBI, the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Portland Red Squad Cooperated

Appeals Court Reverses Income Tax Conviction As Fruit of A Witch Hunt

In recent years there has sometimes been reason to wonder whether the Internal Revenue Bureau used tax prosecutions to punish political dissenters. Vincent Hallinan, the Progressive Party candidate for President in 1952, was an outstanding example; he served a prison term for tax evasion. In tax prosecutions the line between error and fraud is not always too clear, but political motivations are hard to prove. This gives a special interest to the decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit at San Francisco last week in *Reuben G. Lenske v. U.S.* It reversed an income tax conviction on the ground that this was an effort to punish Lenske—a Portland, Oregon, attorney—for non-conformist political activities.

He Showed "Operation Abolition"

The opinion was written by J. Warren Madden, a law professor who was chairman of the National Labor Relations Board in the best days of the New Deal and was later appointed to the U.S. Court of Claims. When the Special Agent's original recommendation for prosecution came to light during the trial, it showed "that he placed high among the reasons why Lenske should be criminally prosecuted for income tax evasion Lenske's being a left-wing lawyer," the Appeals court noted, "and having unorthodox political and social ideas." The Agent reported that Lenske called a meeting to organize a chapter of the Lawyers' Guild, that "Operation Abolition" was shown at the meeting, that he had written a letter to a local paper criticizing U.S. foreign policy, and that the local office of the FBI and "the Intelligence Division" of the Portland police considered him a Communist.

The Court held that the Agent's superiors in the Internal Revenue Bureau, when it saw this evidence of political motivation in his report "should have immediately removed him from the case and discarded every judgment which was contained in his recommendation." The Court said this should have shown the Bureau that the Agent "was confused with regard to his duties and with regard to the basic ideals of his government."

This bias seems to have led to some "gross miscalculations." The Agent, after two and a half years of investigation, charged that Lenske owed $11,465.74 for 1955. The trial judge reduced this to $414.78. The Agent claimed $5,225.77 in tax evasion for 1956. The trial court found instead a tax loss of $9,231.59. The Appeals Court also found that the government had been unfair in withholding information to which the defense was entitled under the rather tricky "net worth" mode of prosecution. We recommend these technical aspects of the decision to lawyers and applaud its declaration on reversal, "This court will not place its stamp of approval upon a witch hunt, a crusade to rid society of unorthodox thinkers and actors by using Federal income tax laws and Federal courts to put such people in the penitentiary."

Useful Quote For Humphrey Hecklers

"Be aggressive—even a little hostile—don't take any glib generalities."

—Vice President Humphrey to the International Association of Police Chiefs in Philadelphia (Baltimore Sun, *Oct. 6*) *a speech in which Humhprey drew a roar of applause by interpolating the remark that he had no use for civilian police review boards when he was Mayor of Minneapolis and implying that he had none now. In view of the crucial vote coming up in New York City on just such a board, we regard the Humphrey remark as a dangerous and shameless bit of opportunism. His reference to glib generalities came in a passage urging the police chiefs to marshal more support for the war against crime and brought "a soft growl of approval." Who could be a greater expert on glib generalities than Humphrey?*

San Francisco's Foremost Newspaper Satirist Looks Into the German Problem

By Arthur Hoppe

High-level negotiations have been going on in Washington over what is called "The German Problem." Which is what Germany has been called for 50 years. To do my part, I've been conducting low level negotiations with Baron Max von Blue, the democracy-loving uberoberfuhrer of West Vaterland, that peace-loving Central European Republic and Marching Society.

The Baron, looking natty in a pin-striped suit with epaulettes and jack boots, welcomed me with the traditional West Vaterland form of greeting: "I-have-never-been-a-Nazi-I didn't know-what-was-going-on-and-good-morning."

* * *

I said I'd come to discuss the 200,000 American occupation troops that had been stationed in West Vaterland for the past 20 years. "Ach, don't apologize," said the Baron. "We are a poor, defeated nation which gladly bows its neck to the yoke of our conquerors. For we have humbly learned our lesson and we will never make war again. Heil peace!"

Fine, I said. But actually we'd now like to withdraw our troops because we need them elsewhere and . . .

"What!" cried the Baron. "You would leave us poor, peace-loving Vaterlanders utterly defenseless?"

But, I said, we couldn't afford it any more. To off-set the cost of maintaining these troops, Vaterland had promised to buy $500 million worth of U. S. weapons annually. And I reminded him Vaterland hadn't bought a thing in two years.

"Himmel, we'd like to," he said. "But who needs? We're up to here already in weapons."

Well, couldn't he draft 200,000 young Vaterlanders to replace our troops?

"They all got deferments," he said, "from working in defense plants."

But certainly no one would dare attack Vaterland in the face of our vast nuclear power. . . .

The Baron's eyes lit up. "Did you bring me my nuclear trigger?" he asked eagerly. "It is such a little thing we peace-loving Vaterlanders request—one little peace-loving finger on your nuclear trigger. A pinkie, even. Ach, then we would see about reunification."

Oh, yes, there was also the problem of reunification with East Vaterland.

"For starters," said the Baron, rubbing his hands, a lock of black hair falling over one eye and his little moustache bristling. "Then, see, we reunify the Lowlands. Crashing through the Maginot Line we reunify France. Then reunifying our way eastward to the Urals, our peace-loving Panzer divisions wheel south across the Caucasus. . . .

* * *

As I tiptoed out, the baron was shouting, "Today, Vaterland; tomorrow, reunification!"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Revelations Show USIA and State, Perhaps Also CIA, in This Operation Brainwash

How the Government Secretly Subsidizes Books As Foreign Policy Propaganda

The publishing business needs a Pure Food and Drug Act of its own which will require that books subsidized by the government be plainly labelled. The first indication that the US Information Agency was secretly subsidizing books came with the belated release last December of the House Appropriations Committee hearings on the USIA budget for fiscal 1965. There (at p. 455) Reed Harris of USIA explained a $195,000 item for "Book Development." He said this was a program "under which we can have books written to our own specifications, books that would not otherwise be put out, especially those books that have strong anti-Communist content, and follow other themes that are particularly useful for our purposes. Under the book development program we control *the thing* from the very idea down to the final edited manuscript." The italics are ours.

"Tailoring" Is The USIA's Word For It

When the hearings were finally published, the names of the books and their authors were blacked out "because" as Harris explained, "our interest in certain of these books should not become a matter of general public information." He mentioned an anti-Castro book among those secretly subsidized, and also a study of Communist tactics by "a socialist-type organization" on which USIA spent $14,952.

A hint that other Federal agencies subsidize books appeared when Lipscomb (*R. Cal*) asked why such books had to be subsidized. Louis A. Fanget, in charge of the book program, said that ordinarily American publishers would not publish anti-Communist books "because they do not sell . . . and even those published commercially sometimes have some Federal support behind them." Do other agencies like the CIA also subsidize books?

Originally this book program was part of a foreign propaganda operation. During the fiscal 1966 hearings (p. 418) Lipscomb asked Harris why these books should be sold at home, Harris replied, "These are responsible people with scholarly reputations and they would not undertake the work at all if they were subject to that restriction." Apparently the marketing, i.e. money making restriction means more to these scholars than freedom from the propaganda agency's blue pencil.

An example of these writers is Jay Mallin, the author of three books. The first was "Fortress Cuba" (Van Nostrand). One wonders whether it is the anti-Castro book referred to in the censored testimony above. The second was Caribbean Crisis, a book about the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic (also Van Nostrand). When Leonard Marks, at the close of the testimony quoted below, suddenly decided in embarrassment to de-classify this book information, it turned out that $2,368 had been paid Mallin for this book. Van Nostrand this year has just published a third book by Mallin, "Terror in Vietnam." This book does not appear on the list released with the fiscal 1967 hearings. "Does that mean," this Weekly asked Fanget, "that the USIA did not finance the later book, or simply that it was not included on the list?" Fanget replied cryptically "I would say that was an accurate statement." He pointed out that the list only covered books subsidized in fiscal 1965.

When the *New York Times* (Oct. 3) questioned USIA officials about the Mallin book on the Dominican crisis, their explanation was that they knew several books were in preparation and "feared they might present the case in a light unfavorable to Washington" so they got in touch with Mallin, a *Time* correspondent who had covered it. The State Department allowed him access to "certain classified documents" for background and deleted certain phrases when the manuscript was submitted to it for clearance. Nothing in the volume would lead the reader to suspect it was financed and cleared by the government. This Big Brotherism in the book business is likely to grow if unprotested.

Praeger Heads List of the Subsidized

For the first time this year, under pressure from House Appropriations Committee, the U.S. Information Agency has declassified the list of books it subsidized. Of $53,591 spent on 16 books in the fiscal year 1965, half, or $27,108 went to Praeger, Inc. USIA spent $3,000 to finance the writing of Ralph P. Slater's Sword and the Plow for Praeger. It also gave what it calls "publication support — regular" to Praeger for five other books: Joseph Hevi's Dragon's Embrace ($2,570); James Wadsworth's Glass House ($7,850), J. D. Atkinson's Communist Front as Weapon of Political Warfare ($8,250); Richard N. Gardner's In Pursuit of World Order ($2,500) and Hoang Van Chi's From Colonialism to Communism ($2,938). The others on this list were Appleton-Century Croft (Raymond's Half the World's People, $7,735); Prentice Hall (Burton's Concise History of the Communist Party: $4,500 and Davis's American Negro Reference Book: $2,985); Bobbs-Merrill (Wittlen's Time Stopped at 6:30: $3,000); Dell (Brooks' Toil and Trouble: $2,578); Curriculum Rev. (Mead and Brown's The Wagon and the Star: $7,275) and Bantam (NY Times, The Witness: $1,770).

Portrait of A Bureaucrat Trying to Talk Himself Out of A Tight Spot

Mr. LIPSCOMB (R. Cal.): **Why is it wrong to let the American people know when they buy and read the book that it was developed under government sponsorship?**

Mr. Leonard H. MARKS (Director, USIA): **It minimizes their value. . . . If we say this is our book, then the author is a government employe in effect. It changes the whole status of the author. . . .**

Mr. LIPSCOMB: I assume that you are distributing them overseas, for lack of a better word, for propaganda purposes.

Mr. MARKS: Yes, definitely, to tell a story.

Mr. LIPSCOMB: Is it being sold in the United States for propaganda purposes?

Mr. MARKS: No.

Mr. LIPSCOMB: Then there is an awfully fine line that exists here.

Mr. MARKS: Propaganda has to be defined. I would like to go into this very briefly. Propaganda has the overtones of Hitler Germany where there is lying, where there is a misrepresentation. I do not believe in that. I have said time and again that all we have to do is tell the truth.

—House Approp. 1967 hearings pps. 620-22

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Essential Issue Is What We Are Doing to the People of Vietnam

(Continued from Page One)

just a step toward peace. But if our military machine crushes the Vietnamese rebellion, it will mete out similar punishment wherever subject peoples seek their freedom from corrupt oligarchies linked with American interests. Vietnam is intended to be a lesson to the poor of Brazil and to the disaffected everywhere; a training ground for the Legions of the Pax Americana. If our military win in Vietnam there will be no holding them elsewhere or at home.

Respect for Boundaries?

The essential issue is the suffering of the Vietnamese people and our unwillingness to bring it to an end unless they surrender to our will. *The threatening precedent is the right of any great Power to bomb any small power into submission.* The test of the United Nations is whether it can focus clearly and sharply on this crime and this menace to world order. To offer Eastern Europe more business and better credits if they will shut their eyes to this is not conciliation but corruption. To offer Moscow a non-proliferation treaty for acquiescence in what we are doing is to shelve German nuclear ambitions at the price of a far greater threat to world law and order. What value is to be placed on our hint that we may accept boundaries in Eastern Europe when we violate them in Eastern Asia? How firm will the Oder-Neisse line be when we get through with the boundaries of North Vietnam and Laos and Cambodia and Thailand?

Let us try to see what is happening in a fresh perspective. What if Japan were again a great military power and it was bombing a small country in Latin America allied with the United States? What would we think if our Secretary of State paid a friendly visit to the Prime Minister of Japan under such circumstances and began to negotiate favors from him, like landing rights for a New York to Tokyo airline? Imagine how Latin allies under Japanese bombardment would feel if they saw pictures of their supposed American protector in friendly confabulation with Tokyo? This may help us to see what Johnson has already achieved in his talks with Gromyko. Whatever else comes of them, the moral affect is debasing. Johnson debases the Russians and he debases the American people. He drags us down into moral imbecility as we allow the killings and the burnings and the defoliations and the lying to go on. Johnson speaks of defending "freedom" in South Vietnam but Poland's deputy Foreign Minister, Winiewicz, spoke the plain truth when he told the UN General Assembly last Monday that "the imposition by force of a military junta" upon the people of South Vietnam was being presented by the U.S. as "an implementation of the principle of self-determination." Compare the Orwellian double-think of Johnson's speech with the anguished description of what we are really doing to South Vietnam in the *New York Times Magazine* last Sunday (Oct. 9) by Neil Sheehan, just back from three years of covering the war.

"I wonder," Sheehan wrote, "when I look at the bombed-out peasant hamlets, the orphans begging and stealing in the streets, and the women and children with napalm burns lying on the hospital cots, whether the United States or any nation has the right to inflict this suffering and degradation on another people for its own ends."

This is the abomination against which the world's conscience must be mobilized. This is the horror we must not let any phoney olive branches elsewhere hide from view. This is the crime our country is committing. And this is what we must condemn, lest a later generation ask of us, as they ask of the Germans, who spoke up?

What McNamara Will Not Admit Publicly

"With the fighting below the demilitarized zone reaching at times the ferocity of the Korean war; with Binddinh Province again a battleground, and with the decision, still unratified but apparently accepted in principle to put American troops in the delta south of Saigon (a battalion of 25th Division infantry is already in Longan province), military advisers argue that Americans are spread too thin, and the safety of troops already in the country requires reinforcements. All of this has raised anew the question: what of the Saigon army? The answer was given off-handedly by one well-placed American who said flatly: 'They are no longer part of the show'."

—Ward Just from Saigon, Washington Post, Oct. 6

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope
Also PLEASE Send in Your Zip Numbers Urgent

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

10/17/66

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED